

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JAMES L. BROOKS,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-2343 JAM EFB P

12 vs.

13 EDWARD S. ALAMEIDA, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action
17 seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
18 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

19 On February 10, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
20 herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any
21 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days from the
22 date the findings and recommendations were served. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings
23 and recommendations.

24 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-
25 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire

26 ///

1 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
2 proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. The findings and recommendations filed February 10, 2009, are adopted in
5 full;

6 2. Defendant Rohlfig's May 5, 2008 motion for summary judgment is granted;
7 and,

8 3. Judgment is entered in his favor.

9 So ordered.

10 DATED: March 26, 2009

11
12 /s/ John A. Mendez
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26